



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/421,818	10/20/1999	JAMES H. WANG	11302-0411	4641

29843 7590 09/23/2002

JOHN S. PRATT
KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP (KIMBERLY CLARK)
1100 PEACHTREE STREET
SUITE 2800
ATLANTA, GA 30309

EXAMINER

VO, HAI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1771

6

DATE MAILED: 09/23/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/421,818	WANG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hai Vo	1771	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 21-42 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, claims 1-20 in Paper No. 5 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the search and examination of both groups could be made without serious burden. This is not found persuasive because the search of Group I would not include the search for Group II.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 1771

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 2, 5-11, and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Topolkaraev et al (US 6,117,438) substantially as set forth in Paper no. 3.
5. Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Topolkaraev et al (US 6,117,438) substantially as set forth in Paper no. 3.
6. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Topolkaraev et al (US 6,117,438) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Wang et al (US 6,172,177) substantially as set forth in Paper no. 3.
7. Claims 1, 7, and 11-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Callahan et al (US 6,057,061). Callahan discloses a microporous film being formed from a uniform blend of 63 volume % ethylene vinyl alcohol copolymer and 37 volume % particulate filler and by a particle stretch technique (example 1, column 2, lines 55-57). Callahan discloses the filler having a particle size ranging from 0.4 to 0.8 microns which is anticipatory of the claims. Callahan discloses the film having a thickness of 10 mils (column 4, lines 18-19). Callahan further discloses the film having a thickness of 5 to 200 microns (0.2 to 7.9 mils). The thickness range of claim 13 overlaps with the value disclosed in Callahan. It seems from the claim,

if one meets the structure recited, the properties must be met or Applicant's claim is incomplete (Note discussion found in Ex parte Slob, 157 USPQ 172). Further, since Callahan is using the same materials and the same technique to form a microporous film as Applicant, it is the examiner's position that the elongation properties would be inherently present within the range as set forth in the claims. Callahan anticipates or strongly suggests the claimed subject matter.

Response to Arguments

8. The art rejections over Andersen have been overcome by the present amendment and response.
9. Applicant's arguments filed on 09/05/2001 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The 102/103 art rejections over Topolkaraev have been maintained because of the following reasons. First, the Topolkaraev reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and

Art Unit: 1771

reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). For applications filed on or after November 29, 1999, this rejection might also be overcome by showing that the subject matter of the reference and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. See MPEP § 706.02(I)(1) and § 706.02(I)(2).

Second, Applicant argues that Topolkaraev fails to teach or suggest a homogeneous blend of a water-soluble polymer and a filler extruded to form a precursor film that is then stretched to form the breathable film. This is not found persuasive. Topolkaraev does disclose both the water degradable and non-water degradable layers can include a filler material (column 7, lines 40-42). The water degradable layer is analogous to the breathable film of the claimed invention. Since the water degradable layer is formed from the uniform mixing of the water-soluble polymer, filler and other additives, it is the examiner's position that Topolkaraev does disclose a homogeneous blend of a water-soluble polymer and a filler extruded to form a precursor film that is then stretched to form the breathable film. Applicant goes on and argues that the claimed film would not be used as barrier films because there is no non-degradable polymer used and the water-soluble polymer would be inadequate as a barrier material. Applicant's arguments are not commensurate in scope with the claims. The language in

Art Unit: 1771

claim 1 does not exclude an embodiment where the film has a non-degradable polymer.

The 103 art rejections over Topolkaraev in view of Wang have been maintained because of the following reasons. Applicant argues that the combination of Topolkaraev and Wang fails to teach or suggest Applicant's claimed invention because Wang simply discloses a grafted poly(ethylene oxide) composition and does not disclose the use of particulate fillers to enhance the breathability of a film after the film is stretched. This is not found persuasive. Wang does supply the missing feature in Topolkaraev, a missing grafted polar vinyl monomer. Wang does not need to teach the use of particulate fillers to enhance the breathability of a film after the film is stretched because the feature has been taught in Topolkaraev. The water-degradable layer of Topolkaraev has been subjected to a plurality of stretching operations to form a porous film (column 11, lines 26-30).

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory

Art Unit: 1771

period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hai Vo whose telephone number is (703) 605-4426. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 8:30 to 5:00 (EAST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris can be reached on (703) 308-2414. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

HV
September 13, 2002


TERREL MORRIS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700